duplication of effort and thin spread of resources as also reduce the overhead costs of implementing various programmes/schemes.

(d) to (f) The on-going schemes to be continued and the new schemes that may be introduced by the Government for the next five year plan would be known only when the said exercise are completed prior to the formulation of the Tenth Plan.

Development in NE States

2974. SHRI SWARAJ KAUSHAL: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that development in North-Eastern States has not been commensurate with huge allocations given by the Central Government during the last few decades;

(b) if so, what steps Government have taken to ensure optimum utilization of the financial assistance;

(c) the Planning Commission has devised some criteria that indicates the financial discipline followed by the North-Eastern States; and

(d) if so, the finding thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): (a) and (b) Development of a Region depends on a large number of factors, such as natural potential, availability of funds; and effective delivery machinery. It is fact that the North-Eastern States have been given liberal plan assistance by the Government of India. As against their share of 3.74 per cent in the total population of the country, these States were given a share of 19.30 per cent in Central assistance by the Planning Commission in 1999-2000. Ninety per cent of the plan assistance to these States is grant and only 10 per cent is treated as loan, as against 30 per cent grant and 70 per cent loan for other States. In addition, the North-Eastern States are also being given non-plan grants from the Ministry of Finance as a result of recommendations of the Eleventh Finance Commission to cover their non-plan deficit.

Despite such liberal assistance, economic growth of the North-Eastern States has not been as good as in other States. The Table shown at Statement-I (taken from the Economic Survey, 2000-01) indicates that the percentage increase in the Net State Domestic product over the period 1993-94 to 1998-99 has generally been less for the NE States as compared to other States (*(See below)*.

3. However, it should be kept in mind that the NE States suffer from several constraints, some of them are beyond their capacity to rectify, at least in the short or medium term, such as

- Poor connectivity
- Geographical isolation
- Inadequate infrastructure
- Less developed formal credit
- Poor quality of land and low agricultural yields
- Little inflow of private capital
- Industrial backwardness, and
- Insurgency

4. Moreover, as opportunities for employment to the educated youth are extremely limited because of inadequate development of the secondary sector, Governments in these States have provided public employment to a very large number of people. This has resulted in massive increase in pension and salary payments, especially after the acceptance of the Fifth Pay Commission Report in 1997.

5. The adverse impact of these factors on economic development and asset creation has been exacerbated by weak delivery structures in these States. However, it is primarily for the State Governments to take remedial action for better implementation. Planning Commission has on several occasions drawn the attention of the State Governments to improve its implementation capacity and achieve sustainable growth. As an extreme measure, Planning Commission has recently asked the Ministry of Finance to stop release of further instalments of Central assistance to Manipur where unauthorized diversion of funds had taken place.

(c) and (d) Several standard indicators exist to measure the fiscal

health of States' finances, such as Debt-NSDP ratio, Balance from Current Revenues (per capita) and Own Revenues (per capita). The performance of the NE States vis-a-vis other States is described in Statement-II.

Statement-I

Net State Domestic product at current prices
(new series)

Sl No.	States	(Rs. in crore)						Average Growth from 1993-94 to 1998-99
		1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	
	ALL INDIA	**685912**	**805981**	**941861**	**1093961**	**1224787**	**1434456**	**15.90**
	North-Eastern Region							
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	8557	9211	11035	10871	11738	12929	8.60
2.	Assam	5715	6493	7001	7394	8026	8700	8.77
3.	Manipur	6046	5664	6885	9062	9793	10599	11.88
4.	Meghalaya	6703	7054	8034	8564	9565	10607	9.61
5.	Mizoram	8158	8558	10563	11648	11667	NA	NA
6.	Nagaland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7.	Tripura	5350	5385	6387	7440	8647	9187	11.42
8.	Sikkim	7588	7948	9581	10990	NA	NA	NA
	Other States							
1.	Andhra Pradesh	7494	8830	10039	11242	11701	13853	13.07
2.	Bihar	3810	4245	4155	4965	5507	5923	9.23
3.	Delhi	17355	20417	21777	23540	25534	27693	9.80
4	Goa	15602	17812	20040	23396	24309	NA	
5.	Gujarat	9997	13100	14248	16366	16998	18792	13.45
6.	Haryana	10970	12747	14145	16729	17426	19773	12.51
7.	Himachal Pradesh	7349	6573	9381	10455	11451	12692	11.55
8.	Jammu and Kashmir	6543	6915	7783	8667	9491	10272	9.44
9.	Karnataka	8190	9508	10792	12729	13621	15889	14.17
10.	Kerala	7788	9432	11390	13089	15195	17756	17.92

Statement-I

Net State Domestic product at current prices
(new series)

Sl. No.	States	(Rs. in crore)						Average Growth from 1993-94 to 1998-99
		1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	
	ALL INDIA	**685912**	**805981**	**941861**	**1093961**	**1224787**	**1434456**	**15.90**
	North-Eastern Region							
11.	Madhya Pradesh	6645	7143	7806	8757	9209	10147	8.83
12.	Maharashtra	12326	13880	16460	18040	19799	22763	13.05
13.	Orissa	4877	5800	6978	6885	8103	8719	12.32
14.	Punjab	12701	13970	15376	17530	18865	20834	10.40
15.	Rajasthan	6251	7628	8361	9876	10189	11045	12.06
16.	Tamil Nadu	9073	10743	12096	13985	15798	17525	14.07
17.	Uttar Pradesh	5287	6064	6605	7637	8273	9261	11.86
18.	West Bengal	6702	7643	8947	9827	11464	12961	14.10
19.	A & N Island	14668	17075	17932	20150	NA	NA	NA
20.	Chandigarh	19921	22383	25827	29672	33216	NA	NA
21.	Pondicherry	9583	10665	11510	16268	18949	23135	19.28

Statement-II

Some Financial indicators—Annual Plan 1998-99

S.N.	States	Debt: NSDP Ratio	BCR Per Capita (Rupees)	Own Revenues Per Capita (Rupees)
A	North-Eastern States			
1	Arunachal Pradesh	64.22	−1584.07	731.66
2	Assam	30.54	−132.38	549.99
3	Manipur	45.11	−743.47	285.19
4	Meghalaya	28.83	−771.33	665.24
5	Mizoram	NA	−1539.79	523.64
6	Nagaland	NA	−1147.41	525.90
7	Tripura	41.84	−679.53	394.43
B	**Other States**			
1	Andhra Pradesh	23.24	−54.94	1304.59
2	Bihar	40.20	−116.97	378.82

Statement-II

Some Financial indicators—Annual Plan 1998-99

S.N.	States	Debt: NSDP Ratio	BCR Per Capita (Rupees)	Own Revenues Per Capita (Rupees)
3	Goa	NA	−542.23	7454.14
4	Gujarat	20.90	−228.65	2211.40
5	Haryana	24.73	−574.00	2422.74
6	Himachal Pradesh	69.60	−1371.56	1306.72
7	Jammu and Kashmir	64.23	−1532.93	797.50
8	Karnataka	19.00	140.76	1680.87
9	Kerala	27.76	−135.55	1619.08
10	Madhya Pradesh	24.41	−154.81	904.93
11	Maharashtra	15.27	154.80	1956.30
12	Orissa	48.80	−386.33	566.84
13	Punjab	42.81	−1065.41	2116.85
14	Rajasthan	36.58	−520.42	1038.31
15	Sikkim	NA	−3192.80	20414.40
16	Tamil Nadu	18.60	−272.63	1799.34
17	Uttar Pradesh	31.84	−470.27	595.59
18	West Bengal	28.48	−550.96	672.92

Centrally Sponsored Welfare Schemes in Assam

2975. SHRI PRAKANTA WARISA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the number of centrally sponsored tribal/hilly welfare schemes going on at present in Assam, district-wise;

(b) the details of the funds allocated by Government for the said schemes in the State during the last three years; and

(c) the details of the achievements made in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): (a) to (c) Details of Centrally Sponsored Tribal/Hilly Welfare Schemes being